

Local Work Group Discussion for EQIP

Nicollet District FY09 EQIP

1. List the local resource concerns that EQIP can address:

- Improper Land application of manure and commercial fertilizer
- Soil Erosion with tillage being a primary concern
- Impaired water caused by concentrated flow
- Erosion in the cropland/bluff land interface
- Grazing Management
- Rare and Declining prairie habitat

2. If applicable, list any geographic regions (i.e. watersheds, townships, etc.) and their respective resource concerns within the District to receive priority:

- Wellhead areas of the communities of St. Peter, New Ulm, Lafayette, Nicollet, Courtland and DWSMA's
- Seven Mile Creek and Rush River watersheds looking at turbidity caused by soil erosion and high nutrient and fecal coliform levels in water caused by improper land application of manure and commercial fertilizer
- The immediate watersheds of Swan Lake and Middle Lake looking at turbidity caused by soil erosion and high nutrient and fecal coliform levels in water caused by improper land application of manure and commercial fertilizer and looking at wildlife habitat.

3. From items 1 & 2 above prioritize the local resource concerns to be addressed with EQIP funding for the district. Describe a minimum of 3 categories of the highest priority applications which you would want to receive funding.

A. Erosion Control	High	9
B. Gully Control	High	9
C. Water Resource	High	10
D. Wastewater/CNMP	High	10
E. Habitat Improvement	Medium	7
F. Air Quality	Medium	8
G. Impaired Water	High	9
H. Distance	Medium	7
I. Grazing System	Medium	6
J. Forest Management	Low	4
K. Additional Local	High	10

4. Develop a minimum of 3 and maximum of 12 yes/no questions to determine if an application is addressing the high priority concerns described in item 3.

Erosion Control-Both sheet and rill and gully erosion:

1. Will the installed practice reduce soil erosion to T or less on the offered acres?

3 Points

2. Will practices such as a Terrace, Water and Sediment Control basin, Grassed Waterway, Grade Stabilization Structure, or other erosion control structure be installed to control gully erosion on offered acres?

5 Points

3. Are the upland watershed acres associated with the drainage area of the practice treated to address sheet and rill erosion to T or less?

10 Points

4. Is the landowner/operator willing to add a buffer in front of the erosion control structure to reduce sediment loss and minimize channelized conveyance?

5 Points

Water Resources and Impaired Waters:

1. Will this practice reduce impairments to impaired receiving waters downstream? (See 2008 Impaired Map)

5 Point

2. Will the installed practice be within 500 feet of receiving waters? (Including lakes, streams, ditches, tile intakes, wells and gully heads)

5 Points

3. Will the installed practice be within 1,000 feet of receiving waters? (Including lakes, streams, ditches, tile intakes, wells and gully heads)

3 Points

Wastewater/CNMP:

1. Will the installed practice eliminate all runoff from the livestock system?

10 Points

2. Will a CNMP (Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan) or a 590 Nutrient Management Plan be developed?

5 Points

3. Is the practice planned a manure storage pit closure?

5 Points

Additional Local:

1. Will these practices that be installed in the watersheds of Seven Mile Creek or the Rush River?

10 Points

2. Will this practice be installed in the Swan Lake Project Area (including the watersheds of Swan and Middle Lake) and will address Water Quality and or Wildlife Habitat resource concerns and issues?

10 Points

3. Will the practice be installed in a municipal well-head protection area or DWSMA of Nicollet County?

10 Points

5. **Assign points to the questions in Item #4 as desired to reflect local priorities. The total points assigned to the questions should be between 35 to 60 points.**

Completed

6. **Submit this worksheet electronically to your respective ASTC (FO). After approval from the state office, the questions will be entered into the Local Issues section of the ranking tool.**

**EQIP Local Work Group Development Meeting
November 5, 2008
St. Peter, MN**

Members Present: Bill Hohenstein, Nicollet SWCD Board Member; Ed Hohenstein, Brown Nicollet Cottonwood Water Quality Board; Blake Honetschlager, Nicollet SWCD Technician; Mandy Landkamer, Nicollet County Environmental Services Director; Deanna Biehn, Nicollet County Feedlot Officer; Kristy Zajac, DNR Swan Lake Assistant Wildlife Manager; Ken Rossow, Nicollet County Bank; Pam Rivers, Nicollet County Water and Wetlands Coordinator; Mark Kulig, NRCS Area 6 Program Specialist; Stephanie McLain, St. Peter District Conservationist

Bill Hohenstein welcomed the group and had everyone introduce themselves. Stephanie McLain started the discussion of the Local Work Group Priorities by detailing what had happened for EQIP 2008: A total of 23 contracts with approximately \$586,000 obligated. There was a variety of practices from residue management, soil erosion control practices, nutrient management, well sealings, invasive species removal, manure storage structures, mortality composters and manure pit closings.

The Local Work Group reviewed the local resource concerns list from 2008 and decided that looked good. The list brought a significant amount of discussion about outreach for conservation practices using EQIP and how we can better get this information out to the public. The group listed the different newsletters that were available in the county: SWCD newsletter, Extension Newsletter, FSA newsletter, Swan Lake newsletter plus the Nicollet Lafayette Ledger as great publication sources. Also discussion was held looking at increasing outreach to crop consultants and have them sell the program for us.

The group then reviewed the geographic regions that should receive priority. The group decided to remove county wide well sealings from the priority geographic region list due to the fact that this isn't really a region and also because the SWCD also cost-shares for well sealings.

The group reviewed the priority list and the only changes discussed were changing Air Quality from a low priority to a Medium Priority. Deanna stated air quality issues are becoming a bigger issue with manure storage and land application. This is the main issue that neighbors to animal producers complain about. The group agreed to make Air Quality a medium priority.

The group then reviewed the ranking questions from 2008. Discussion ensued about the points for questions 2 & 3 under erosion control. Instead of giving the high points for installing a terrace or other erosion control structure, the group decided to reduce question 2 to 5 points and increase the point for questions 3 to 10 points. The idea is that we need to address upland treatment even more than just fixing an erosion point in the field. If the landowner continues have erosion above the "T" soil loss levels then the question is if we should even be out there installing the structure. Hopefully, this will bring more landowners into EQIP for residue management.

Under the Water Resources and Impaired Waters questions, the group decided to reword question 1 and increase the points to 5 points. Pam and Ed will be providing a map for this question. The question now looks at the reduction of the pollution that causes the listed impairment on a body of water.

Under the Wastewater/CNMP questions, Deanna brought up a common situation in Nicollet County where a landowner has existing storage but due to increases in animals, the storage is only for 1-2 months. She is wondering if there is a way to add a ranking question about lack of manure storage. Mark Kulig brought up the point that for EQIP there is no minimum requirement for storage as long as the producer has a place to apply the manure. The group decided to keep this off the local ranking worksheet but Deanna did request to add a question about manure storage pit closure. The group thought this was a good idea and the question was given 5 points.

Under the Additional Local questions, the group decided to eliminate question 4 pertaining to well sealing. For questions 3, the group agreed to reword "identified well-head protection area" to "municipal well-head protection area".

This is the end of the meeting notes.